From: Geoffe Elias
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/24/02 5:08am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement (Geoffe Elias)

To the US Department of Justice,

I have read the proposed settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft Corporation. I believe that such a settlement not only fails to stifle the business practices that have brought Microsoft to court in the first place, but also creates a dangerous precedent in which in the future,

companies like Microsoft may be allowed to use their dominant positions in industry to shut out competition.

I have been a Microsoft User since Windows 3.11. It was during sophomore year in High School, that I got

computer to use for my schoolwork and computer game play. This was the year 1992.

Now it is 10 years later in 2002. During those past 10 years, I have found that being a customer of Microsoft had been unnecessarily expensive. How? 2 reasons: As a customer, I have had to constantly upgrade to keep my computer able to play current software, and in the case of MS Office, to maintain file compatibility with other people using MS Office

The other reason is that Computer makers will always include the latest version of Windows in their products without providing the consumer a choice in Operating Systems from other companies.

Upgrade Cycle:

I had started with Windows 3.11. From then on, I have

purchased boxed copies of Windows 95, Windows 98, and

Windows ME. In terms of MS Office, I have purchased Office 95, Office 97, and Office XP. In the case of the operating system, I worry that support of previous

versions of the operating system will cease as Microsoft lends its support and focus on the latest operating system (currently Windows XP). In the case

of MS Office, file formats written in MS Office change

between each release of MS Office. Thus, I feel pressure to upgrade to the latest version of MS Office

in order to maintain file compatibility with my fellow

students.

As Microsoft proponents have explained, it is important to have industry standards such as file standards (standards: a common set of rules by which to design a file so that devices or applications following such rules will be able to successfully interact with such a file). Yet, Microsoft uses *proprietary* standards where those rules are hidden from the public. Thus, only Microsoft applications can use this secret standard and also, Microsoft is able to use their dominant position in industry to push their standards as the only standard available for use.

**It would be nice if such standards were public so that any company can make software for files written with such public standards...

FORFEITURE OF CHOICE

MS Windows is installed on every new computer built by

a computer company whether the consumer wishes it or not. For example, I had bought a new laptop computer

from Dell (Dell Corporation). At the time, the only choices for operating systems to be installed in that

computer were either Microsoft Windows 2000 or Microsoft Windows ME. It is interesting to note that

the choice to buy a laptop without any operating system installed was absent. Thus, as a consumer buying from Dell Corp. the choices were limited to: buying a computer with Microsoft Windows installed, or

buying no computer at all.

Due to what I see as inherent instability, lack of control, and bloat (excessive programming code that makes a program run slower) of Microsoft Windows design, I decided to switch to Linux. However, as a

Linux user, if I want to install new hardware (such as

a TV Card, Sound Card, etc) into my desktop computer,

I must first do research to see if the open source (public) community has created drivers (software designed to make a piece of hardware work under a given operating system) and applications (software designed to allow for the use of the given hardware) for that piece of add-on hardware. The fact is that

significant number of companies only provide driver and software support for only Microsoft. This condition in the marketplace where there is little hardware vendor support for operating systems besides

those of Microsoft provides another unnecessary pressure to consumers to use Microsoft products.

I realize that this letter only provides complaints without proposing solutions. However, I feel that the

current settlement does little to change the business

practices that have led to a lack of choice for consumes regarding their software solutions.

I would also like to point out that any solution that

requires an overseer (a group or person to look over the future business practices of Microsoft and make corrections as necessary) would be an abrogation of responsibility by the US Department of Justice in dealing with the problems that Microsoft's business practices have created. Any solution that is made must itself prevent future attempts by Microsoft to use their dominant position in industry to lessen competition. An overseer would and should not replace

the court in deciding what punitive and corrective actions should be applied to Microsoft.

Thank you for your attention.

Geoffe Elias

AIM: geoffe02

quote:

"I have lived long enough and had enough success as well as enough failure to tell you that you can never get discouraged, and you can never quit.

...Because you can never know when a chance for a miracle will pass you by."

--former President Clinton

Do You Yahoo!? Great stuff seeking new owners in Yahoo! Auctions! http://auctions.yahoo.com